



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,613	12/31/1999	NIMROD DIAMANT	042390.P7493	8070

7590 10/14/2003
STEVEN D YATES
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
7TH FLOOR
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/476,613

Applicant(s)

DIAMANT ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the first data" in the first limitation of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the data configuration" in the third limitation of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the protocol" in the fourth limitation of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 24 recites the limitation "said processing" in the second limitation of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2142

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-2 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens.

10. As to claim 1, Stevens teaches a method utilizing multiple network interfaces (col. 3, lines 15-52), comprising: receiving a first network data to be transmitted by a first network interface according to a protocol (col. 3, lines 15-52, Data is received at adapter 205 in Figure 2); determining whether the first network interface supports the protocol (col. 5, lines 9-32, The filter object determines what protocol is being used.); if the protocol is not supported, then providing said first network data to a second network interface for processing of said first network data into a second network data according to the protocol (col. 5, lines 33-67 and col. 6, lines 1-23, The stack associated with adapter 210, in Figure 2, processes the communication from adapter 205); and transmitting said network data with said first network interface (col. 6, lines 24-63, The stack associated with adapter 205 sends data.).

11. As to claim 2, Stevens teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first network interface does not support the protocol, the method further comprising: presenting the first and second network interfaces to a protocol stack as being a homogeneous team of network interfaces (col. 3, lines 15-52).

12. As to claim 20, Stevens teaches in a computing device, a network interface team (col. 3, lines 15-52), comprising: a first network interface lacking support for a protocol (col. 3, lines 15-52, Adapter 205 does not support TCP/IP.); and a second network interface supporting the protocol (col. 3, lines 15-52, Adapter 210 does support TCP/IP), said second network interface configured to process network data for the first network interface if said network data is to be transmitted according to the protocol (col. 5, lines 33-67 and col. 6, lines 1-23, The stack associated with adapter 210, in Figure 2, processes the communication from adapter 205) and to return processed data to the first network interface (col. 5, lines 9-32, An enable indication is sent back to the stack associated with adapter 205 from the stack of adapter 210.).

13. As to claim 21, Stevens teaches the network interface team of claim 20, further comprising: a first receiver, communicatively coupled to said first network interface, for receiving network traffic to be transmitted by said first network interface (col. 3, lines 15-52, Adapter 205); a second receiver, communicatively coupled to said second network interface, for receiving, communicatively coupled to said second network interface, for receiving network traffic to be transmitted by said second network interface (col. 3, lines 15-52, Adapter 210); and a transferor, communicatively coupled with said first network interface and said second receiver, and configured to transfer network traffic to said second network interface for processing according to the protocol (col. 5, lines 33-67 and col. 6, lines 1-23).

14. Claims 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,108,562 to Rydbeck et al..

15. As to claim 22, Rydbeck teaches a method for sharing processing capabilities of members of a system of network interfaces among the system members, comprising: determining a first

Art Unit: 2142

network interface is to transmit a first data (col. 3, lines 29-51); determining the first data is configured in a manner unsupported the first network interface; locating a second network interface of the system that supports a data configuration (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-31); secondarily processing by the second network interface of the first data in accordance with a protocol into a second data (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-31); and providing the second data to the first network interface so that the second data appears to have been processed by the first network interface (col. 4, lines 12-32).

16. As to claim 23, Rydbeck teaches the method of claim 22, further comprising: selecting the first network interface to transmit the first data based at least in part on a load-balancing of network traffic across the plural network interfaces (col. 5, lines 31-43); performing by a driver for the first network interface of said determining the first data is configured according to the protocol unsupported by the first network interface (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-31); receiving by the driver the second data, wherein the data is now in a format supported by the network interface; and providing the driver of the second data to the first network (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-31).

17. As to claim 24, Rydbeck teaches a method for distributing network processing across a team of network interface cards including at least a first network interface card lacking support for a first specialized capability and a second network interface card that supports the first specialized capability (col. 4, lines 12-32), the method comprising: receiving first data to be processed and transmitted by the first network interface card to a recipient (col. 3, lines 29-51); determining a processing of the first data requires the first specialized capability unsupported by the first network interface card secondarily processing by the second network interface card of

Art Unit: 2142

the first data into second data with the supported first specialized capability(col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-31); and providing the second data of the first network interface card for transmission to the recipient (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-31).

18. As to claim 25, Rydbeck teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the second network interface card comprises an application specific integrated circuit providing the first specialized capability (col. 2, lines 58-67 and col. 3, lines 1-13).

19. As to claim 26, Rydbeck teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the team of network interfaces include a third that supports a second specialized capability, the method comprising: aggregating specialized capabilities offered by interfaces of the team (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-31); and providing a virtual network interface card appearing to providing each of the specialized processing capabilities (col. 4, lines 50-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,438,678 to Cashman et al..

22. As to claim 3, Stevens teaches the method of claim 1; however Stevens does not explicitly teach encrypting the network data.

Cashman teaches a method wherein the protocol includes encrypting the first network data before submitting said first network data to a network (col. 7, lines 66-67 and col. 8, lines 1-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Stevens regarding a method for processing data with differing protocols with the teachings of Cashman regarding encrypting network data because such capabilities may be needed in for transmitting data in various network scenarios (col. 7, lines 48-65).

23. As to claim 4, Stevens teaches the method of claim 1; however Stevens does not explicitly teach an encryption processor handling the network data.

Cashman teaches a method comprising communicatively coupling a hardware-based encryption processor with said second network interface, said encryption processor performing said processing of said first network data (col. 7, lines 66-67 and col. 8, lines 1-17).

For reasons stated in the rejection of claim 3 it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Stevens and Cashman.

24. As to claim 5, Cashman teaches a method wherein the hardware-based encryption processor supports a primary mode for encrypting network traffic for a second network interface, and a secondary mode for encrypting network traffic for a first network interface (col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-3).

25. Claims 6-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,438,678 to Cashman et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,424,621 to Ramaswamy et al..

Art Unit: 2142

26. As to claim 6, the Stevens-Cashman combination teaches a method wherein said second network interface interleaves said primary mode encryption with said secondary mode encryption (Cashman, col. 8, lines 53-67 and col. 9, lines 1-3), however; neither Cashman or Kimber mention adaptive load balancing in there systems.

Ramaswamy teaches a method wherein a first and second network interface operate in an adaptive load-balancing mode (col. 6, lines 25-48, Figure 3 shows a system with two network interfaces that performs load-balancing via the control processor.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Stevens-Cashman combination regarding a method for processing data with differing protocols with encryption with the teachings of Ramaswamy regarding load balancing because load balancing improves network performance (Ramaswamy, col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 1-24).

27. As to claim 7, Ramaswamy teaches the method comprising providing a third network interface supporting the protocol; wherein processing said first network traffic into said second network data is balanced across said second and third network interfaces (col. 6, lines 25-48, Figure 3 also shows a third interface, in which the load balancing occurs.).

28. As to claim 8, Ramaswamy teaches a method wherein said balancing is performed according to a workload of said second and third network interfaces (col. 6, lines 25-48, Figure 3).

29. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,438,678 to Cashman et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,222,855 to Kimber et al..

Art Unit: 2142

30. As to claim 9, the Stevens-Cashman combination does not explicitly teach fault tolerance.

Kimber teaches a method wherein the said first and second network interfaces operate in an adapter fault tolerance mode, and wherein said first network interface is a primary network interface, and said second network interface is a backup network interface (col. 4, lines 36-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art to combine the teachings of the Stevens-Cashman combination a method for processing data with differing protocols with the teachings of Kimber regarding fault tolerance because fault tolerant systems reduce the chance of impacts from failures (Kimber, col. 4, lines 36-48).

31. As to claim 11, the Stevens-Cashman combination does not explicitly teach fault tolerance.

Kimber does not explicitly say that the first interface is a backup for the second interface. Kimber teaches a method wherein adapters operate in an adapter fault tolerance mode and the first and second adapters have backup network interfaces (Figure 3 shows a backup interfaces.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art to combine the teachings of Kimber regarding a method for processing data with differing protocols with the teachings of Kimber regarding fault tolerant adapters because any of redundant interfaces could be used as a backup interface. It would have then been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art to combine the teachings of the Stevens-Cashman combination a method for processing data with differing protocols with the teachings of Kimber regarding fault tolerance because fault tolerant systems reduce the chance of impacts from failures (Kimber, col. 4, lines 36-48).

Art Unit: 2142

32. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,424,621 to Ramaswamy et al..

33. As to claim 10, Stevens teaches the method of claim 1; however Stevens does not explicitly teach a load balancing system.

Ramaswamy teaches a method wherein a first and second network interface operate in an adaptive load balancing mode, and wherein said network interface interleaves processing network traffic for said second network interface with processing first network traffic into said second network interface (col. 6, lines 25-48, Figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Stevens regarding a method for processing data with differing protocols with the teachings of Ramaswamy regarding load balancing because load balancing improves network performance (Ramaswamy, col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 1-24).

34. Claims 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,222,855 to Kimber et al..

35. As to claim 12, it features similar limitations to claim 1, with the exception of the last limitation that states that the second network data is transmitted with the second network interface. Stevens does not teach a system in which a protocol conversion is done by a second interface and then transferred by the second interface

Kimber teaches a system in which a protocol conversion is done by a second interface and then transferred by the second interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art to combine the teachings of Stevens regarding a protocol conversion system with the teachings of Kimber regarding the use of a second interface for transmission because transmitting directly from the second interface increases communications efficiency (Kimber, col. 2, lines 11-48).

36. Claims 13-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,222,855 to Kimber et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,438,678 to Cashman et al..

37. As to claims 13-15 and 19, the feature the same limitations as claims 3-5 and 9 and are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3-5 and 9.

38. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,324,583 to Stevens in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,222,855 to Kimber et al. and U.S. Patent Number 6,438,678 to Cashman et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,424,621 to Ramaswamy et al...

39. As to claims 16-18, the feature the same limitations as claims 6-8 and are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6-8.

Response to Arguments

40. Applicant's arguments filed 7/15/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the following points: (a) A traversal from the first network interface to the second network interface and back to the first network interface for transmission by the first network interface is not taught by Stevens; (b) The cited portion of Stevens at col. 6, lines 24-63 does not teach interplay in that the cited portion only discusses using a single network

adapter; and (c) Stevens teaches interfacing two network stacks, and does not discuss presenting network adapters as a homogenous team..

41. As to point (a), each protocol stack is considered a separate network interface.

42. As to point (b), the claims limitations themselves do not mention a network adapter.

Although the claims are read in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

43. As to point (c), there are no limitations which pertain to adapters therefore the term network interface is interpreted broadly.

Conclusion

44. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2142

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B Blair whose telephone number is 703-305-5267. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

Douglas Blair
October 2, 2003

DBB


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100